DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 116 730 JC 760 048

AUTHOR Garlock, Jerry C.
TITLE Collective Bargaining; Attitudes of College Presidents Compared with Presidents' of Academic Senates. OIR-75-25.
INSTITUTION El Camino Coll., Torrance, Calif.
REPORT NO OIR-75-25
PUB DATE Dec 75
NOTE 6p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.58 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; *Chief Administrators; *Collective Bargaining; Collective Negotiation; College Faculty; Comparative Analysis; *Faculty Organizations; *Junior Colleges; Presidents; Teacher Administrator Relationship
IDENTIFIERS California

ABSTRACT

A questionnaire on collective bargaining was sent to California community college presidents and presidents of academic senates in the spring of 1975. Respondents included 101 college presidents and 101 presidents of academic senates. The questionnaire consisted of 22 statements, about which respondents were to express their degree of agreement on a five point scale. Data were subjected to probability analysis by means of the chi-square statistic to determine significant differences between the two groups responding. Only three comparisons between college presidents and academic senate presidents showed no significant differences. Two comparisons showed significant differences only at the 5 percent level of confidence. All other comparisons were significant at the 1 percent level of confidence. Listed with the greatest difference first, college presidents and academic senate presidents disagreed on statements including these: collective bargaining will destroy or significantly weaken the collegiality of the institution; presidents should directly participate in collective bargaining negotiations; collective bargaining will have a beneficial effect on higher education; collective bargaining will bring the faculty and board closer together. A comparison of the percentage results of the questionnaire is appended. (NHM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED116730

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING: ATTITUDES OF COLLEGE PRESIDENTS COMPARED WITH PRESIDENTS' OF ACADEMIC SENATES

EL CAMINO COLLEGE

OIR 75-25

December 31, 1975

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

JC 760 048

OFFICE OF RESEARCH

JERRY C. GARLOCK, Ph.D.

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING: ATTITUDES OF COLLEGE PRESIDENTS COMPARED WITH PRESIDENTS' OF ACADEMIC SENATES

A questionnaire on collective bargaining was sent to California community college presidents and presidents of academic senates in the spring of 1975 by Ken Neary, Director of Research for Cabrillo College. Of the 22 items of the questionnaire, 18 items had responses from both groups for which comparisons could be made. There were 101 college presidents as well as 101 presidents of academic sentates that responded to the questionnaires.

Neary reported the results in terms of frequencies of a five point rating scale as shown in the appendix. These data were subjected to probability analysis by means of the chi-square statistic to determine significant differences between the two groups responding. The results are shown in Table 1.

Only three comparisons between college presidents and academic senate presidents showed no significant differences. These comparisons were: (1) collective bargaining will bring the Superintendent/President and board closer together; (2) collective bargaining will unite the faculty into a strong and aggressive political force; and (3) during the spring semester 1975, had a faculty collective bargaining contract vote been held on your campus, the results would have favored unionization.

Two comparisons which showed significant differences at the five per cent level of confidence were: (1) Superintendent/Presidents should express their views to their faculty about collective bargaining; and (2) Superintendent/Presidents should serve only as counselors and mediators for their boards and faculties in collective bargaining negotiations.

All other comparisons were significant at the one per cent level of confidence indicating that the differences are sufficiently different, that

that there is only one chance in one hundred that the differences are due to chance. These differences are presented as follows.

1. Collective bargaining will destroy or significantly weaken the collegiality of the institution.

2. Superintendent/Presidents should directly participate in collective bargaining negotiations.

3. Collective bargaining will have a beneficial effect on higher education.

4. Collective bargaining will bring the faculty and board closer together.

5. Under collective bargaining, unions will exploit the majority of faculty members for the benefit of the few.

6. The scope of collective bargaining should be limited to compensation and hours.

7. Superintendent/Presidents will have their effectiveness in governance reduced by collective bargaining.

8. Collective bargaining will significantly improve faculty salaries and conditions of work over what they will be under present governance conditions.

9. The "agency shop" requiring faculty members to pay union dues even though they do not choose to become union members is unprofessional.

10. Collective bargaining will make governance of the college easier for the administration.

11. Collective bargaining will tend to isolate the Superintendent/President from the faculty.

12. The "agency shop" requiring faculty members to pay union dues even though they do not choose to become union members violates the tenure law.

13. Agency shop agreements should have a "conscientious objection" provision.

Table 1

LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE OF COMPARISONS BETWEEN PRESIDENT/SUPERINTENDENTS AND PRESIDENTS OF ACADEMIC SENATES OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES IN CALIFORNIA

LEVEL OF DIFFERENCE	COMPARISON
Comparisons showing no significant differences	Collective bargaining will bring the Superintendent/President and board closer together.
	Collective bargaining will unite the faculty into a strong and aggressive political force.
	During the Spring Semester, 1975, had a faculty collective bargaining contract vote been held on your campus, the results would have favored unionization.
Difference at the 5% level of confidence	Superintendent/Presidents should express their views to their faculty about collective bargaining.
	Superintendent/Presidents should serve only as counsellors and mediators for their boards and faculties in collective bargaining negotiations.
Difference at the 1% level of confidence (Listed with the greatest difference first)	Collective bargaining will destroy or significantly weaken the collegiality of the institution.
	Superintendent/Presidents should directly participate in collective bargaining negotiations.
	Collective bargaining will have a beneficial effect on higher education.
	Collective bargaining will bring the faculty and board closer together.
	Under collective bargaining, unions will exploit the majority of faculty members for the benefit of the few.
	The scope of collective bargaining should be limited to compensation and hours.
	Superintendent/Presidents will have their effectiveness in governance reduced by collective bargaining.
	Collective bargaining will significantly improve faculty salaries and conditions of work over what they will be under present governance conditions.
	The "agency shop" requiring faculty members to pay union dues even though they do not choose to become members is unprofessional.
	Collective bargaining will make governance of the college easier for the administration.
	Collective bargaining will tend to isolate the Superintendent/President from the faculty.
	The "agency shop" requiring faculty members to pay union dues even though they do not choose to become union members violates the tenure law.
	Agency shop agreements should have a "conscientious objection" provision.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

FEB 6 1976

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES

APPENDIX

COMPARISON OF PERCENTAGE RESULTS OF TWO QUESTIONNAIRES

SUPERINTENDENT/PRESIDENT AND ACADEMIC SENATE PRESIDENT RESPONSES TO COLLECTIVE BARGAINING FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTIES

Upper Figures: Superintendent/Presidents
Lower Figures: Academic Senate Presidents

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Undecided	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
1. Superintendent/Presidents should express their views to their faculty about collective bargaining.	56	17	6	15	6
	71	10	10	8	0
2. Superintendent/Presidents should directly participate in collective bargaining negotiations.	2	4	13	17	63
	24	16	18	18	24
3. Superintendent/Presidents should serve only as counsellors and mediators for their boards and faculties in collective bargaining negotiations.	27	29	17	8	19
	16	29	10	18	26
4. Superintendent/Presidents will have their effectiveness in governance reduced by collective bargaining.	48	33	10	6	4
	13	31	13	10	31
5. Collective bargaining will bring the Superintendent/President and board closer together.	31	42	13	8	4
	29	34	29	8	0
6. The scope of collective bargaining should be limited to compensation and hours.	75	8	10	6	2
	18	16	10	13	42
7. Collective bargaining will destroy or significantly weaken the collegiality of the institution.	52	40	4	4	0
	10	21	13	16	39
8. Collective bargaining will make governance of the college easier for the administration.	0	17	10	25	48
	13	29	18	26	10
9. Collective bargaining will unite the faculty into a strong and aggressive political force.	11	21	15	40	11
	16	29	21	31	3
10. Collective bargaining will bring the faculty and board closer together.	4	0	0	13	83
	0	8	26	34	31
11. During the Spring Semester, 1975, had a faculty collective bargaining contract vote been held on your campus, the results would have favored unionization.	4	11	25	31	29
	8	24	21	24	24
12. Collective bargaining will tend to isolate the Superintendent/President from the faculty.	37	40	15	8	0
	16	29	13	21	21
13. Collective bargaining will have a beneficial effect on higher education.	0	6	4	25	65
	24	18	24	16	18
14. Collective bargaining will significantly improve faculty salaries and conditions of work over what they will be under present governance conditions.	0	10	29	38	23
	16	31	24	26	3
15. Under collective bargaining, unions will exploit the majority of faculty members for the benefit of the few.	37	23	29	10	2
	8	26	13	21	31
16. Collective bargaining will strengthen the role of the state in community college governance.	21	48	19	6	6
	X	X	X	X	X
17. The "agency shop" requiring faculty members to pay union dues even though they do not choose to become union members:					
a. is unprofessional	52	27	8	4	0
	26	18	10	16	26
b. violates the tenure law.	25	13	38	13	2
	8	5	37	13	24
18. Agency shop agreements should have a "conscientious objection" provision.	46	27	19	2	2
	31	29	8	8	24
19. Collective bargaining will bring the faculty and administration closer together.	X	X	X	X	X
	0	13	16	50	21
20. Collective bargaining contracts should include Division Chairmen and Chairwomen in the faculty bargaining unit.	X	X	X	X	X
	50	21	16	3	10
21. The adversarial relationship between faculty and board/administration is exaggerated.	X	X	X	X	X
	18	34	8	22	18
22. Under collective bargaining, the bargaining agent is likely to follow the "one man, one vote" rule and thus shift the influence on governance from the tenured faculty to the non-tenured and part-time faculty.	X	X	X	X	X
	16	42	16	16	8